

From: [LeBoon](#)
To: [Mr. Mittens & Pirate](#)
Cc: [City Clerks Office](#); [Anderson, David](#); [Christiansen, Robin](#); [Lewis, Brian E.](#); [Hugg, Dave](#); [Donyale Hall](#); [Sudler, Roy](#); [Neil, Fred](#); [Joan Sciple](#); [ralphltaylorjr@gmail.com](#); [Johnson, T.](#); [Boggerty, Andre M.](#); [Pillsbury, Julia M.](#); [Rocha, Gerald L., Sr](#); [Arndt, Tricia K.](#); [Dave Lees](#)
Subject: EXTERNAL: Re: panhandling & Lockerman
Date: Saturday, February 21, 2026 2:06:57 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cleboon89@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Honorable Clerk,

I am writing out of deep concern for what is happening in our community. I plan on attending the upcoming meeting, and I want my position to be absolutely clear: immediate action is needed, and the proposed safety ordinance deserves full support.

What is taking place along this roadway is not minor, isolated, or exaggerated. Open drug use, drug sales, prostitution, and other criminal activity are occurring openly and repeatedly in broad daylight. I see it with my own eyes as I travel this area regularly. Families drive this road. Residents live nearby. Emergency responders are called into these conditions. This should not be normalized, and it should not be tolerated.

Our community deserves better. Residents deserve to feel safe driving, walking, and living in their own neighborhoods without witnessing blatant criminal conduct on a daily basis.

While I understand that the fence proposal is intended to help, I am concerned that it addresses only part of the problem. A barrier alone will not solve what is clearly a larger public safety crisis. We must be honest about the scope of what is happening and respond accordingly.

I am aware that the American Civil Liberties Union reached a settlement with the Delaware Attorney General's Office regarding pedestrian loitering enforcement. Civil liberties are important. However, the rights of residents to safety, order, and peace in their community are equally important. There has been far too little public acknowledgment of the ongoing open criminal activity that continues to impact this area.

This situation calls for strong, decisive leadership. I urge the Council not only to pass the safety ordinance but also to consider forming a dedicated task force to fully address the broader issues at hand. Community members, public safety officials, and civil liberties representatives should come together to develop real, lasting solutions.

We cannot look the other way. We cannot accept this as the status quo. The people who live here deserve action.

Thank you for your attention and your service.

Respectfully,

Cassandra LeBoon

On Sat, Feb 21, 2026 at 1:55 PM Mr. Mittens & Pirate <slspiders@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: Continued Support for Safety Ordinance

Dear Honorable Clerk,

Please accept my apologies for the additional correspondence. I know I have written multiple times and have included you previously, but this matter is extremely important to me and to the safety of our community.

I have cleared my schedule and will be in attendance. However, I felt compelled to once again express my unequivocal support for the proposed safety ordinance. I strongly believe it should be passed unanimously and without hesitation for the protection of both residents and pedestrians.

I sincerely hope we can reach a positive resolution on this matter so that the City Council can then move forward to address the ongoing concerns surrounding the fence issue. As reported in the news, there are serious problems involving drug activity, prostitution, and other deeply troubling situations that I have personally witnessed while traveling that road daily.

I would also like to commend Councilman Brian for his thoughtful remarks to the press. As a retired volunteer firefighter with over 30 years of service, I appreciated his forward-thinking perspective and his commitment to protecting firefighters and first responders.

While I believe the fence proposal is well-intentioned and thoughtfully developed, I am concerned that it may not provide a sustainable long-term solution.

In conducting my own research, I noted that the ACLU successfully negotiated a settlement with the Attorney General's Office regarding pedestrian loitering. However, I have not seen public commentary addressing the ongoing open drug use, drug sales, prostitution, and other criminal activity occurring in broad daylight — activities that firefighters and residents have observed firsthand. It is sick and extremely disturbing and it must be reviewed.

In closing, I respectfully suggest that a task force be established to further study this issue. Collaboration with community stakeholders — including representatives from the ACLU —

could be beneficial. Perhaps structured on-site observation (A powwow or daily two hour luncheon) and engagement could help develop strategies that both uphold civil liberties and restore safety, stability, and peace of mind to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your continued service and consideration of these concerns.

Steve LeBoon
1025 Westview Terrace
Dover, Delaware

On Fri, Jan 30, 2026 at 11:27 AM Mr. Mittens & Pirate <slspiders@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Honorable Attorney General Jennings,

I am writing as a resident of Dover, Delaware, to express my support for the recent decision of the City of Dover Council, in which six members voted in reliance on your legal judgment and interpretive expertise. I agree with my council representatives and believe their decision reflects sound reasoning and responsible governance.

I have included my own perspective as a resident, along with relevant United States Supreme Court case law addressing this sensitive issue. I will be brief out of respect for your office, but I believe it is important for citizens to articulate their views, particularly when constitutional interpretation is involved. If any official has both the authority and responsibility to provide clarity and guidance to the City of Dover, it is the Attorney General of Delaware.

I have long respected your leadership, especially during the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, when you consistently acted to protect the health, safety, and rights of Delaware's residents. What concerns me now is the broader public-safety impact at issue. While attention is often focused on a relatively small number of individuals, there are approximately 100,000 to 200,000 motorists who travel through the City of Dover daily. Their safety and my own right to safe passage also deserves serious consideration.

Attorney General, democratic accountability is grounded in the faithful application of the law. It is not a passive responsibility. Rather, it carries an affirmative obligation to engage with municipalities and to apply binding United States Supreme Court precedent where it governs. Democratic legitimacy is earned through this kind of principled engagement with elected local officials, and you have consistently demonstrated that commitment.

For your convenience, I have enclosed a summary and analysis of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, including a Yale Law School publication that thoughtfully examines the case and its implications:

Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015)

Yale Law School – Information Society Project

Thank you for your continued service, and please allow me also to commend the dedicated officers of the court who work tirelessly to make Delaware one of the best states in the nation.

It is one of the many reasons I am proud to live in Dover. Our mayor, the president of council, and the other five council members have demonstrated care, sound judgment, and thoughtful reasoning in their service to the community, and they deserve recognition for their contribution in leadership.

Thank you for considering my perspective and for your continued commitment to applying constitutional principles consistent with United States Supreme Court precedent. I hope that, in the near future, you will be able to provide guidance that aligns clearly with that case law.

Respectfully,

Steve LeBoon, Ph.D, M.E.d, MS., B.S.

Dover, Delaware

484-716-4567

On Tue, Jan 27, 2026 at 10:46 PM Mr. Mittens & Pirate <slspiders@gmail.com> wrote:

Good evening, Honorable City Clerk,

I recognize that my prior submissions have been circulated on multiple occasions; however, I want to ensure that you and the members of council are fully aware of the relevant case law and legal standards established by the United States Supreme Court. These precedents have, for many years, expressly authorized municipalities across the country to enact measures designed to promote public safety.

I respectfully hope that this matter passes by unanimous vote, as it represents a lawful and appropriate exercise of municipal authority to protect citizens in a clear and unequivocal manner. Should there be disagreement with my position, I would encourage a careful review of the controlling case law that I have previously furnished and incorporated into this proposed ordinance.

It is also notable that the ACLU has raised objections without addressing the existence or substance of this controlling precedent. They had the opportunity to fully litigate these issues in 2015, and while they advanced limited arguments under the First Amendment, their broader claims were unsuccessful. That history is significant.

For these reasons, it is highly unlikely that the United States Supreme Court would revisit or overturn this issue for decades, if at all.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Steve LeBoon, Ph.D

Cassandra LeBoon, Ph.D

Dover, Delaware Resident

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Christiansen, Robin** <rchristiansen@dover.de.us>

Date: Sun, Nov 16, 2025 at 7:48 AM

Subject: Re: EXTERNAL: Late submission regarding safety ordinance for panhandling

To: LeBoon <slspiders@gmail.com>

CC: City Clerks Office <CityClerk@dover.de.us>, City Council
<CityCouncil@dover.de.us>

Good morning, Thank you both for sharing your personal insight and observations. I appreciate you both because you understand the issue and unlike others have offered some concrete carefully thought out solutions. Thank you again for being part of this great adventure we call Dover, the place where America started. Warmest regards Robin
Robin R. Christiansen
Mayor City of Dover

On Nov 15, 2025, at 5:14 PM, LeBoon <slspiders@gmail.com> wrote:

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Steve & Cassandra LeBoon

1025 Westview Terrace

To the Honorable Members of the Council:

I hope you are all having a pleasant weekend. My wife Cassandra and I appreciate the opportunity to submit this late feedback regarding the proposed panhandling and donation-safety ordinance currently under consideration. We have listened to public comments from both supporters and opponents, and while there have been many thoughtful concerns raised, we noticed that some discussion did not reflect the relevant U.S. Supreme Court guidance concerning panhandling regulations.

As you know, panhandling is closely connected to First Amendment protections, and ordinances regulating solicitation in public spaces must pass intermediate scrutiny. Such ordinances must:

1. Be content-neutral;
2. Be narrowly tailored;
3. Leave open ample alternative channels of communication; and
4. Serve a significant, legitimate government interest.

Many panhandling ordinances across the country have been struck down even under this standard. For example, the First Circuit Court of Appeals invalidated Portland, Maine's ordinance in *Cutting v. City of Portland* (2015) because it was not narrowly tailored and restricted too much expressive activity. I highlight this not to be redundant, but because it is essential that any ordinance the Council adopts be constructed on firm legal ground that protects both public safety and constitutional rights.

Personal Perspective and Experiences

My view of panhandling is shaped significantly by personal experience. I have a twin brother who struggled with mental-health issues and panhandled for many years, despite having a stable income (\$45,000 per year), his own apartment, and access to basic needs. Even though I'm his personal power of attorney, I was unaware he was panhandling until he was arrested for harassing individuals. He later served a federal sentence related to unrelated circumstances, but through him and through speaking with other individuals directly—I learned a great deal about why some people panhandle.

Contrary to common belief, many individuals who panhandle in our area are not homeless. In fact, when I personally spoke with 10–15 individuals near the Sam's Club area, nearly all of them lived comfortably at the hotel by Lowe's and Chick-fil-A. The weekly rate for that hotel is approximately \$400 per week, even with no monthly discount. At that price, panhandling becomes, frankly, a lucrative activity. I do not blame them for seeking income, but I believe the public should understand the reality: in this area, panhandling is frequently not a matter of homelessness, but of opportunity and personal circumstances.

Safety Concerns

While I am compassionate toward those who panhandle and have even helped some directly, safety must remain a top priority. Just last night, on Route 13 near the Aldi intersection, my wife and I witnessed a panhandler standing in the road, nearly struck by vehicles twice. The individual appeared unfazed. This is not an isolated incident. The safety risks to both the panhandler and the driving public are very real and increasing.

Because of these dangers, I strongly support measures that reduce panhandling in high-traffic roadways and intersections while still respecting constitutional limits and human dignity.

Constructive Recommendation

If individuals wish to panhandle, perhaps they should do so on properties

where social-service interactions are appropriate and safer, such as:

- unemployment offices
- welfare offices
- state government service centers

These locations provide safer environments, ample parking lots, and direct access to officials and services that might assist them more effectively than roadside solicitations.

Closing

In closing, we want to thank each of you for your service to our city. We are proud to live in what we consider one of the best communities in the country, with strong leadership from a dedicated council and a mayor who has shown commitment year after year.

We hope you will consider our experiences and observations as you evaluate this ordinance. Thank you for all you do, and we wish you a wonderful holiday season.

Respectfully,

Steve and Cassandra

1025 Westview Terrace